

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of KAYLA AMMYRE CRAWFORD,  
VICTOR KIRBY CRAWFORD, and STEPHANIE  
ADELE CRAWFORD, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
September 25, 1998

v

No. 206003  
Wayne Juvenile Court  
LC No. 94-321138

VICTOR WAYNE CRAWFORD,  
  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

KARMALEEDA JEAN CRAWFORD,  
  
Respondent.

---

Before: Holbrook, Jr., P.J., and Wahls and Cavanagh, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating his parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

Respondent-appellant received proper notice of the permanent custody proceedings. Because respondent-appellant appeared in the probate court at a temporary custody hearing after he was personally served with a summons, which included a prominent notice that the proceedings could result in the termination of his parental rights, additional personal service of a summons was not necessary for the permanent custody proceedings. MCR 5.920(F). Appellee attempted to notify respondent-appellant of the permanent custody proceedings by personal service and certified mail to his last known

address and then by publication because he had changed his residence during the proceedings but failed to notify the foster care case worker of his new address. Service by publication is permissible under the Due Process Clause<sup>1</sup> where the person's whereabouts are unknown. *Krueger v Williams*, 410 Mich 144, 165-166; 300 NW2d 910 (1981).

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. See MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Furthermore, respondent-appellant failed to provide some evidence from which the court could conclude that termination was clearly not in the best interests of the children. See *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Thus, the juvenile court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children. See MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Myron H. Wahls

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh

<sup>1</sup> US Const, Am XIV; Const 1963, art 1, § 17.